REMARKS

Careful review and examination of the subject application are noted and appreciated.

SUPPORT FOR CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Support for the amendments to claims 1, 2, 12, 13 and 14 can be found in the drawings, as originally filed (for example, in FIG. 1). Support for the amendments to claims 3 and 15 can be found in the specification as originally filed (for example, on page 11, lines 16-21). Support for the amendments to claims 7, 23 and 26 can be found in the drawings, as originally filed (for example, in FIGS. 2-3). Support for the amendments to claims 24 and 25 can be found in the drawings, as originally filed (for example, in FIG. 3, and on page 14, lines 9 through 22 and on page 15, lines 1 through 6 of the specification). As such, no new matter was added.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The objection to claim 8 has been obviated by appropriate amendment to the claims and should be withdrawn.

EXAMINER'S ANALYSIS SECTION

Applicant's representative respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of pixels. As stated in the Office Action Response filed December 10, 2004, while some references refer to pixels in an analog sense, those references typically refer to a post A/D conversion. If the so-called analog pixels are interchangeable with more commonly understood digital pixels, why is it necessary to implement an A/D conversion process? In any event, the present amendment to the claims should obviate the issue.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-15, 17-19 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Chen et al. has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

Chen discloses a list controlled video operations (Title).

In contrast, the present invention provides an apparatus comprising a first circuit and a second circuit. The first circuit may be configured to present an output signal having a first resolution and a plurality of output pixels in response to (i) an input signal having a second resolution and a plurality of input pixels and (ii) one or more control signals. The input signal is stored in a register file a scan line at a time in response to a data request signal. The second circuit may be configured to generate the control signals in response to (i) a previous calculation by the first circuit and (ii) one or more input parameters. The first circuit may be configured to scale and filter the input signal to allow one or more of the input pixels to contribute to the creation of one or more of the output pixels.

The apparatus comprises a portion of a block move engine. Claims 12 and 13 provide similar limitations.

In particular, Chen fails to teach or suggest storing an input signal in a register file a scan line at a time in response to a data request signal. Nothing in Chen responds to such a data request signal. At best, Chen teaches that a list of commands 301 which are read by an ASIC 200 directs where the DMA controller 901 should place received video data (column 6, lines 65-67 and column Chen further teaches the "list of commands 7, lines 1-2). continues until all of the designated video storage location have been written" (column 7, lines 13-14). In response to writing all of the designated video storage locations; a new writing sequence is started again (see Chen, column 7, lines 14-15). commands 301 in Chen is not the presently claimed data request signal since the list of commands provides a repetitive mechanism for writing to the DRAM 308 (Chen, column 7, lines 15-17). contrast, as noted by the applicant, "input data ... is generally presented one pixel when the request signal DATAREQ is active" (see page 10, lines 12-14 of the specification). The list of commands 301 in Chen are executed in response to a pointer and not by the activation of any input received by the DRAM 308 (see FIG. 9). At best, Chen provides a repetitive process for receiving and storing video data with no apparent control over the list of commands other than implementation of a pointer. However, Chen does not teach or suggest a register file a scan line at a time in response to a data request signal. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over Chen and the rejection should be withdrawn.

With respect to newly amended claims 2 and 14, Chen fails to teach the presently claimed multiplexer configured to generate an output signal by selecting the plurality of input signals from the register file in response to one or more control signals. Specifically, Chen fails to teach a multiplexer configured to select video data from any of the memory locations 902a-902c from the DRAM 308 (see FIG. 9 of Chen). As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over Chen and the rejection should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 4 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Bilbrey has been obviated and should be withdrawn. Claim 4 depends, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, which is now believed to be allowable. Claim 16 has been canceled.

The rejection of claims 9 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Watson has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn. Claim 9 depends, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, which is now believed to be allowable. Claim 20 has been canceled.

As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the present application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicant's representative at 586-498-0670 should it be deemed beneficial to further advance prosecution of the application.

If any additional fees are due, please charge Deposit Account No. 12-2252.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTORHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.

Christopher P. Maiorana Registration No. 42,829

Dated: May 9, 2005

c/o Henry Groth
LSI Logic Corporation
1621 Barber Lane, M/S D-106 Legal
Milpitas, CA 95035

Docket No.: 00-339 / 1496.00116